

**REMARKS**

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 3 has been amended to particular point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 6,441,715), claims 6, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson ('715) in view of Fujino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,002), claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson ('715), and claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson ('715) in view of Marty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,031,445). The Applicant respectfully traverses.

Johnson does not anticipate or render obvious the Applicant's claims. In particular, Johnson does not teach all of the elements of the independent claims 1 and 8. Claim 1 claims:

*A transformer comprising:*

*a first inductor having one or more trenches and comprising a first conductor defining a signal path along the one or more trenches of the first inductor, and a first magnetic layer defining a path along the one or more trenches parallel to the signal path of the first conductor; and*

*a second inductor having one or more trenches and comprising a second conductor defining a signal path along the one or more trenches of the second inductor, and a first magnetic layer defining a path along the one or more trenches parallel to the signal path of the first conductor.*

Similarly, independent claim 8 claims the elements of a conductor over trenches of an inductor, the conductor defining a signal path along the trenches of the inductor, and a magnetic layer defining a path along the one or more trenches parallel to the signal path of the conductor. Johnson does not teach an inductor having one or more trenches, a conductor defining a signal path along the one or more trenches, and a magnetic layer defining a path along the one or more trenches parallel to the signal path of the first conductor. In contrast, Johnson teaches an inductor 1000 having raised and patterned third metal film portions 700 formed over and separated by a third insulator layer 500. The third metal film portions are connected to one another by vias 600 and portions of the first metal layer 200. Johnson also teaches a magnetic layer 400 in the same plane as the vias 600, and not a magnetic layer

defining a path along the one or more trenches parallel to the signal path of the conductor. Additionally, both Fujino and Marty fail to teach the claim elements of an inductor having trenches, a conductor defining a signal path along the trenches, and a magnetic layer defining a path along the one or more trenches parallel to the signal path of the conductor. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 8 and claims 2-7 and 9-17 that depend from and incorporate the elements of claims 1 and 8, respectively, are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Johnson, Johnson in view of Fujino, or Johnson in view of Marty.

Application No. 09/813,496  
Amendment filed October 8, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of July 8, 2003

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 10/8, 2003

Heather M. Molleur  
Heather M. Molleur  
Reg. No. 50,432

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300